

MASS. ED44.2: C21



312066 0273 8067 3

---

THE CARNEGIE

---

SCHOOLS

---

PROGRAM IN

---

MASSACHUSETTS

---

A DOCUMENTATION OF THE START-UP

Massachusetts Department of Education  
Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation  
Office of Community Education

August, 1988

Prepared by Sabra Price

004/39



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2013

<http://archive.org/details/carnegieschoolspr00pric>





---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Goals	2
Departures and Risk	4
Start-up	9
Technical Committee	11
Regional Forums	13
Printed Materials	16
Informational/Technical Assistance Meetings	19
Review Process: Proposal Reading and Site Selection	24
What Can We Pass on?	31

### Appendices:

- A Chapter 727
- B Chronology of Events
- C Cover letter from Commissioner of Education  
to School Superintendents.
- D List of Technical Committee members
- E Technical Committee: Roles and Responsibilities
- F Flier for Regional Forum
- G Sample questions asked at Northeast Regional Forum
- H Copy of statewide mailing
- I Chapter 727, Carnegie Schools, Questions and Answers
- J Request for Proposals
- K Synopsis of 7 proposals from schools  
nominated for planning grants.
- L Technical Assistance Plan
- M Packet for proposal readers and site visitors (guidelines,  
criteria, rating sheets)



---

## INTRODUCTION

In May, 1986, the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy issued the report of its Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. The report's theme is restructuring schools "to provide a professional environment for teaching", and encouraging educators "to decide how best to meet state and local goals for children while holding them accountable for student progress".

In Massachusetts the education reform movement gathered strength when educational leaders began discussing school based changes in relation to Chapter 188, the Massachusetts Public School Improvement Act of 1985. A Special Commission on the Conditions of Teaching was established by the Legislature after Chapter 188 was passed. Its work culminated in the development of a report, issued and disseminated in August, 1987, entitled, Leading the Way: The Report on the Special Conditions of Teaching.

Among other school reform strategies, the Commission recommended the establishment of Carnegie Schools. In January, 1988, the Carnegie Schools Program was enacted by the Massachusetts Legislature within the provisions of Chapter 727, An Act Enhancing the Teaching Profession and Recognizing Educational Achievement (Appendix A).

The legislative intent of the program as stated was:

- 1. To encourage the public schools of the Commonwealth to plan and develop innovative organization and management systems at the school building level, to produce better learning opportunities and empower public school professionals.*
- 2. To encourage and support the development of management systems that provide increased autonomy and discretion for school-based professionals and encourage innovative organizational strategies to enhance student learning.*

In a letter to all school superintendents the Commissioner of Education described the program's purpose as providing opportunities:

*for schools with a strong commitment to shared decision-making, and schools that can secure and demonstrate support from the district level, the school-based community, and their local associations. It is for schools that have a vision of where they want to be in four years and believe that change in school organization can lead to change in student outcomes.*

Between August '87 and March '88 the Offices of Planning, Research and Evaluation and Community Education of the State Department of Education laid the groundwork for the program. March ushered in a series of meetings for schools and districts interested in the Carnegie Schools Program, 38 proposals were submitted by May 20 for the first funding cycle, and 7 sites were nominated for \$50,000 planning grants on June 23 (see Appendix B for chronology).

Enclosed in this document is a review of each step in the start-up of this program. In an attempt to be as useful as possible comments from participants and observers have been included, as well as a selection of agendas, memos, department-generated materials, and summaries of proposals submitted by the schools and districts (see Appendices).





## GOALS

The Carnegie Schools Program is viewed by many as the centerpiece of Chapter 727:

*I view it as the central initiative in terms of long term school reform in the state. I see the Carnegie Schools as crucial for meeting our long range goal of professionalizing teaching. (Governor's Advisor on Education)*

The central goal of the program is improved student performance, achieved through empowering teachers:

*It began under the rubric of the Commissioner's focus on the conditions of teaching. On the one hand there is the danger of focusing too exclusively on teacher related goals but we must not confuse means and ends. The kids are the end. (Governor's Advisor on Education)*

*There are two exciting prospects for the Carnegie Schools: improved student performance because of the release, the challenge to teachers to do what is necessary to enable every child to learn, and achievement and satisfaction for all participants. (Commissioner of Education)*

The importance of this program to education reform efforts in the state influenced the manner in which it was approached by the Department of Education and the urgency with which it was launched during the spring of 1988.

The Carnegie Program was spearheaded by the Commissioner and his Offices of Planning, Research and Evaluation and Community Education, rather than a program office, giving it a status rarely enjoyed by new programs. Some of the other ways in which this program represents a departure from tradition are discussed in the section entitled DEPARTURES AND RISK.

The development of the Carnegie Schools Program was guided by several assumptions, stated by the Commissioner of Education:

*Each child, teacher, and school is unique. Every child can learn. Although each school should be different, the goals are the same from school to school: self-sufficient, confident students capable of thinking, writing, problem solving and participating.*

Because of the nature of Carnegie Schools as envisioned by program planners, that there is no one model and that Carnegie Schools should be designed in response to local needs, the Department of Education approached the implementation of this program in a less prescriptive fashion than is usual for them.

*The Carnegie proposal is "we support interesting things and we don't want to tell you what interesting things are". Some people will always be uncomfortable but it is the only reasonable approach for Carnegie. If the Department of Education says "here's how to do restructuring" it would be 180 degrees away from site based. (Massachusetts Secondary School Administrators Association)*



---

The process through which the Department of Education developed and launched the program was viewed as unusually important, and itself served as an overarching goal: the process was described as one which should:

1. be educational for schools;
2. include vision building by schools;
3. model those processes integral to restructuring efforts.

Two implications of this approach were that input would be sought from all constituencies in an open manner and that the Department of Education would provide overall parameters for a Carnegie School but would not offer specific prototypes or models.

It took a lot of effort from a lot of people to hammer Chapter 727 into shape and negotiate its passage through the legislature. Once passed, the timeframe for program startup was short; the Department of Education chose to complete the first funding cycle in six months. Although it could have opted for a different time frame, there was feeling that the Department should select recipients of the first planning grants by the end of the fiscal year, June 30, in order to continue the momentum of the bill's passage. Past experience had taught Department staff that without at least one cycle underway it would be difficult to secure funding and support for the following year.

Some of those farther from the political, and closer to the school, reality have had difficulty with the compressed timeframe:

*Getting the political and school clocks together has been difficult. The short time line put pressure on the schools who know the program has huge implications and visibility, and that they need to show results to keep the Legislature interested. (Massachusetts Teachers Association)*

The Department of Education also believes that the process has been far from ideal—too rushed, without ample time for fine tuning on either their own part or that of the schools submitting proposals. Within the constraints of the political and school calendars, the Department attempted to remain as responsive to schools as possible. Rolling grant cycles were designed to meet the state's need to get the program underway. Three grant application cycles were projected throughout the spring and fall of 1988, providing schools that were not ready to meet the first deadline two later opportunities to apply.





## DEPARTURES AND RISK

*Carnegie is like stepping off of a precipice. It is not safe.  
(Massachusetts Association of Secondary School Principals)*

*Carnegie requires educators and others to take risks. It is an open-ended process that has no one concrete model for people to follow. Each school's plan will differ from others. There is no 'correct' approach which is a new and challenging way of operating for some people. (Carnegie School Planner)*

The Carnegie Schools Program is an innovative program about changing the ways schools are run, professionals share power, and students learn. It is about restructuring schools. While some school professionals are uncomfortable with its approach, others welcome it with excitement. In a statewide mailing to all superintendents, school committee chairs, principals, and education association presidents, the Commissioner of Education wrote:

*This is not a program for every school that desires change; it is designed specifically for schools with a strong commitment to shared decision-making and schools that can secure and demonstrate support from the district level, the school-based community (teachers, principals, staff, parents), and their local associations. It is for schools that have a vision of where they want to be in four years and believe that change in school organization can lead to change in student outcomes.*

Just as the program itself is innovative, its design and implementation represent a departure for the Department of Education in numerous ways. These departures from the way programs have traditionally been planned and implemented have predictably met with mixed responses. As with any innovation, change has been greeted with a combination of interest, enthusiasm, disbelief, and resistance.

## THE DEPARTURES

1. This program has been spearheaded by the Commissioner, with his visible interest and commitment. This has given the Carnegie Schools an enhanced status.

*By heading the technical committee, the Commissioner indicated his enthusiasm for this approach to school improvement. (Carnegie School Planner)*

2. This program is interdivisional in nature. It has been managed by the Commissioner's Offices of Planning, Evaluation and Research and Community Education, unlike most other programs which are housed in specific program offices. The departure here is two-fold: not to run it out of a program office, and to make it interdivisional:

*Carnegie Schools is a department-wide program and not affiliated with any one program area. By making it department-wide and interdivisional the Commissioner is indicating the importance of*



---

*Carnegie Schools to the Department and modeling the broad based approach that will characterize these schools. (Carnegie School Planner)*

*The matrix cutting across lines has been good. It is easy for new programs to get lost in the bureaucracy. I give the Department of Education high marks for keeping this program out of the quicksand. (Technical Committee)*

In addition, it was decided that, as a new program, Carnegie Schools should initially be run out of the central office, rather than regionally.

With the long-term goal of regionalizing the program, the Department of Education has folded regional center staff into the process as a kind of in-service training. Regional representatives were part of the review teams serving as both readers and site visitors. The proposal review process, however, has been on a state-wide basis rather than a regional one, indicating another departure for the state:

*We have used a statewide rather than a regional reading process. The idea for centrality came out of the Technical Committee whose overriding concern was quality. The central office is frequently involved in policy and program design but the long term goal is regionalization. (Carnegie School Planner)*

3. The process has been open; input was solicited from constituencies before the guidelines were written. The Department of Education met with many professional organizations and other groups during the initial startup phase, seeking their concerns and ideas, and incorporating them into planning. Representatives of those organizations were both pleased and surprised.

*It was helpful that the Carnegie Planners met with the executive board of the three principal associations. It was a real help, a clear statement of their investment of time and energy and caring in what we think. It is also a means of letting us know whom we are dealing with, their attitudes and points of view. This was a departure. In the past, the only time the Department of Education met with us was when we were going 'bananas' and requested a meeting. (Massachusetts Secondary School Administrators Association)*

*The process has been good. They got a perspective from involved organizations. It gave people a chance to see how the state is operating. In the past the Department has not been viewed in a positive way. This is changing now and there is a shift to more credibility. Getting good people out there interfacing with practitioners markets the department. (Massachusetts Elementary School Principals Association)*

4. The process, open by design, appeared less defined than people are accustomed to from the State Department of Education:

*Usually they try to sell an end result. This was done differently. (Technical Committee, superintendent)*





An early round of statewide meetings, co-sponsored by the Massachusetts Teachers Association, the Department of Education, and the Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents, was designed to encourage participants to dream, develop visions, and discuss the Carnegie Schools Program in global terms, anticipating problems and issues schools might face. Some of the participants found them unsatisfactory, vague, and ambiguous, and resisted the new approach, looking for something more task oriented: "Tell me what I have to do to get the money".

*There was an amorphousness at the first meeting and people reacted with dubiousness: 'the state doesn't know what they are doing'. By the second meeting they saw it as a strength. (superintendent)*

*The forums were non-directive in nature, process oriented. We were in agreement. Many people are uncomfortable with that process because they assume it is completely planned if it's initiated by the state. (Massachusetts Teachers Association)*

The process has developed trust:

*Success rests on whether the Department of Education enjoys the trust of its constituency in the field, the belief that they are interested in helping the field do what they do. It has been a key piece to this. Old feelings can be changed. (Massachusetts Secondary School Administrators Association)*

5. Technical Committee: Most new educational initiatives are guided by specific task forces made up of internal department staff and representatives of professional organizations. The advisory group for the Carnegie Schools was approached differently. Called the Technical Committee because its work was envisioned as being technical in nature, the group of 17 included only three Department of Education participants (including the Commissioner) and no representatives of professional organizations.

*This is a different approach. The criteria for the Technical Committee was that people have a strong research or experience base. We used practitioners, service providers, and local change agents. (Carnegie School Planner)*

The insistence on representation by practitioners was an important ingredient. The decision to exclude representatives of professional organizations was met with dismay by the Massachusetts Teachers Association who felt excluded by the process, despite their other avenues for input:

*We feel disenfranchised. We are spectators. There is no teacher or staff from the MTA or other teachers' union on the Technical Committee and that has consequently made me question what they are doing. We believe it is necessary for us to participate because we are part of the family. (Massachusetts Teachers Association)*



---

Although not part of the Technical Committee, teachers were involved in other aspects of the program. The Massachusetts Teachers Association joined in sponsorship of a major event, and teachers were included in the proposal review process and site visits.

6. The proposal review process represents another departure for the Department of Education. Traditionally this has been an internally staffed task; the Carnegie proposal reading teams contained parents, principals, superintendents, teachers, in addition to Department of Education staff (both regional and central). Involving different role groups was a deliberate attempt to model the restructuring process itself.

While proposals are usually selected according to regional criteria among others, the criteria for Carnegie Schools in the first cycle was the quality of the proposal and evidence of ability to carry it out. The absence of political weighting has led to reactions of relief as well as suspended belief:

*There has been no sign of 'we'll take 2 from this region and 2 from that'. The process usually goes that way. My regional director is uncomfortable because of his lack of control, but he doesn't feel too badly because Carnegie Schools have not been prearranged to scatter by region. It is very important to choose good candidates. (Massachusetts Secondary School Administrators Association)*

Two school principals interviewed about the process indicated that they expect the old process to work in this case; both reported that they 'knew' which schools would receive planning grants because of connections and geography. (They guessed wrong.)

## CHANGE

As envisioned, Carnegie Schools are innovative, calling for real change, which engenders resistance:

*Anything you suggest to administrators that is 180 degrees different is too threatening. There was a defensive reaction from a lot of administrators. Laying empowerment on existing structures makes people nervous. (teacher)*

The parallel changes in the Department's program management and implementation have also run up against disbelief as well as delight:

*The Commissioner is exciting but it is still a bureaucracy and when we receive something on their stationary, it is treated as another piece of paper from the Department of Education. The enthusiasm that Carnegie generates wasn't a bells and whistles type because of the reputation the Department has had in the past. It is like the story of opening the door of the bird cage and the bird doesn't fly out. People are leery. The state was saying 'we'll change the regulations'; people don't believe it yet. (Technical Committee, superintendent)*



---

The bottom line is that change comes slowly:

*The business of restructuring is going to be very slow. We've been doing things one way for 100 years. We can't expect change in the next two. It is okay to be patient. (principal)*

*It is an incredibly exciting effort but you can't be too naïve about how fast it can go. People have little ability under stress with long term habits to make significant change. The struggle in the middle is long and hard. A lot we select as sites won't make it. What is not clear enough in the legislation and the RFP is that you are undoing the way things are done. People won't believe they are asking for major change. (Technical Committee)*

Some people recognize a need to protect the Carnegie Schools from premature evaluation, believing that it can be counterproductive to innovation. There is some further understanding that when evaluation does take place it will need to be innovative and matched to the schools themselves, instead of a more traditional, sole reliance on standardized tests as a measure of success.





---

## START-UP

---

Even before the Special Commission on the Conditions of Teaching published its report recommending the establishment of Carnegie Schools, the Department of Education began laying the groundwork in anticipation of the program.

In May of 1987 the Commissioner of Education submitted a proposal to the National Governors' Association requesting funds to carry out "the necessary background work for successful implementation of a very exciting new initiative in Massachusetts: the Carnegie Schools Program," identifying it as "a plan developed by a strong collaboration among the Massachusetts Department of Education, the Governor's Office for Educational Affairs, and the Legislature with particular leadership from the Joint Committee on Education". The proposal was funded and funds were matched in kind by the Department, enabling the subsequent planning in the fall '87-spring '88.

In July 1987 the Directors of the Planning, Research and Evaluation and Community Education Offices began regular meetings to plan the 'next steps' for Carnegie Schools. One of their first tasks was to begin to identify members for an 'advisory council' (later named the Technical Committee) in concert with the Commissioner and the Governor's Advisor on Educational Affairs.

The Commission on Teaching released its two reports in August, triggering more activity both inside and outside the Department. Inside the Department the metaphor for the start-up process was 'building and flying the airplane at the same time'. A teleconference memo dated August 20, 1987 details the multitude of issues being planned simultaneously:

- public information and awareness
- filing legislation (who does what)
- budget items
- advisory council-thoughts and tasks
- practitioner groups for reality testing guidelines
- pre-application phase (self-guided survey)
- application phase: site visits, rolling admissions
- post-application phase
- legal issues-regulations requiring waivers
- liason with professional organizations

In September the Department of Education mailed the two Commission reports to all school superintendents with a cover letter from the Commissioner soliciting reactions and announcing his intent to meet with the Executive Committee of the Superintendents' Association in October "to share your views on these proposals so that we might help the Legislature in its deliberations" (cover letter; Appendix C). The October meeting took place per schedule.

In November the Department of Education began meeting with the following groups:

DOE    Regional Directors  
MASS (MA Association of School Superintendents)  
MASC (MA Association of School Committees)  
MTA    (MA Teachers Association)  
MFT    (MA Federation of Teachers)  
MESPA (MA Elementary School Principals Association)  
MSSAA (MA Secondary School Administrators Association)  
Lucretia Crocker Fellows





Leadership Academy Fellows  
Massachusetts Community Education Advisory Council  
Chapter 188 Evaluation Advisory Committee

*Our approach was not to draft guidelines but to go to the the different audiences and say 'we hope and expect that the Carnegie School Legislation will pass. Before we draft anything we want to hear your issues and let you in on the ground floor'. We felt it would be possible to see what they were most concerned about and anticipate critical implementation issues; we would also have a better understanding of who needed to be brought in when. (Carnegie School Planner)*

Overall, the different groups provided input on the various steps involved in launching the Carnegie program. Predictably, the special concerns of each group surfaced. The School Committee Board worried about possible conflicts between their role and new reform initiatives in the schools; the Massachusetts Secondary School Administrators Association voiced concern that the pivotal role the principal plays in leading effective schools was being overlooked and recommended that changes in the duties of principals be made clear and that the principal not become a "last resort decision-maker"; Massachusetts Elementary School Principals Association reacted saying "the concept is exciting and positive if the principal's responsibilities are not abridged"; and the Massachusetts Federation of Teachers suggested language for contract negotiations "that would allow districts to experiment. Sometimes contracts have clauses for handling new issues". The Massachusetts Teachers Association stressed the importance of communicating directly with teachers, not just with the principals and superintendents.

There were two payoffs. The meetings provided the Department with the 'reality test' they sought, allowing them to anticipate some concerns and issues of the school community in general. They also began to set a collegial tone for the whole process, modelling the kind of representative dialogues that restructuring is all about:

*Our committee talked about what the guidelines should look like, how the Department should solicit proposals, how it should evaluate them, and the criteria for what constitutes a reasonable plan. We probed restructuring governance vs broader restructuring. The Department was very responsive to our concerns and interests. They came in an open frame of mind and dialogued freely. People felt listened to. When our comments are reflected in what they say later on, it matters. This was a qualitative change from several years ago. It has blown a breath of fresh air into the Department. Real progress has been made. (Massachusetts Elementary School Principals Association)*

*We had some concerns about Carnegie and the perceived loss of power of the school committees. When they told us that local school committees could decide if they wanted to give up their power or not it diffused some of our fears. (Massachusetts Association of School Committees)*



## TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

*The representative part of the process was the Commission where we had representatives from constituencies and put together the legislative design. Once it was enacted, my view was that we needed a set of people who knew the school change process. (Governor's Advisor on Educational Affairs)*

The Technical Committee began to take shape in July of '87 when the Planning and Community Education offices began to work on the Carnegie Schools Program. An August memo from the Commissioner to Senator Kraus informed him that the Carnegie School Planners were beginning to form a committee "charged with the responsibility to develop the criteria for the awarding of grants" (memo).

At the point of establishing criteria for Technical Committee members, the Department had to address the issue of conflict of interest since the committee could include teachers, principals and superintendents whose schools might want to apply.

*When we began we decided to form an advisory committee, but not like the Commission with representatives from all the professional associations. Because we wanted representatives of different constituencies, we spent a lot of time creating a balanced committee composed of people who knew about the change process, and have been responsible for restructuring schools. Initially we wanted people who would not have a vested interest because they would not want to apply for a grant. Clearly this was not going to work so we consulted with our General Counsel who said that as long as these individuals stayed out of particular parts of the process it was okay, so we modified the charge. (Carnegie School Planner)*

The Technical Committee was composed of 17 members including the Commissioner of Education and the two Department of Education Carnegie School Planners (See Appendix D for list of participants.) The Technical Committee met 4 times throughout the winter and spring of 1988 (Appendix E). While it offered input into most aspects of the program, it provided critical contributions to the development of the March mailing (which included a concept paper, self assessment form, and selected readings), the Question and Answer book, and criteria for selection of schools. According to program planners, about 95% of their feedback was used. Aside from attending formal meetings, individual members provided valuable advice through informal channels. Several committee members also contributed to the program by serving on panels at the Regional Forums and presenting both at statewide informational meetings and at the orientation session for proposal readers and site visitors.

Committee members were comfortable with the composition of their group and felt that they played an appropriate role:

*The composition was broad enough so that a variety of perspectives were heard. It's been important that a lot of practitioners were heard. (Technical Committee, superintendent)*



*The DOE started with ideas that could be improved upon but they listened hard to what people said. They created a situation where the group feels its views are really sought. (Technical Committee)*

*The meetings served their purpose. I'm not sure you could do them better. People asked questions and others could answer them. There was a general effort to become clearer about the process of what was meant by restructuring. (Technical Committee)*

The decision to exclude representatives of professional organizations was deliberate, but the Department of Education may decide to mend fences with any of those organizations that felt left out of the process, notably the Massachusetts Teachers Association; the unions will be a critical ingredient in the success of this program.

*We have a disagreement with the Carnegie Planners about the Technical Committee. From their perspective we are represented on other committees who participate as advisors. Their view is that the Technical Committee is just that -not policy- but nuts and bolts. From our view, technical issues may inform the rest of policy. (Massachusetts Teachers Association)*





## REGIONAL FORUMS:

After the first round of November meetings, the Massachusetts Teachers Association approached the Department of Education to ask if they would be interested in co-sponsoring a series of Regional Forums on Carnegie Schools. Since the Department was not the initiator of the idea it was able to cosponsor the forums even though the Massachusetts Federation of Teachers was not included. The Department agreed and planning took place over the course of four meetings. Later the Massachusetts Teachers Association decided to also invite the Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents to join in sponsorship; the Department of Education agreed. The other professional associations were invited to attend, but were not co-sponsors.

*The Principals' Associations were not co-sponsors, but the union represents a large number of administrators in the Commonwealth. We did have a principal at each planning meeting. I felt that the principals, while not formally represented, would see this as a symbol of our commitment to the importance of the principal's role in restructuring but some did not. (Carnegie School Planner)*

In retrospect the planners feel that it was an unfortunate decision not to have the principal as a co-host. The principals felt left out of the equation and their absence, along with the Massachusetts Federation of Teachers', was noticed by some participants.

Planning for the Forums was begun before the legislation was passed. The three organizations approached the forums with the intent of stimulating discussion and encouraging participants to do some global thinking about restructuring and its implications for their schools. Once the legislation passed, however, it proved difficult to steer participants in this direction:

*We billed the Forums as information sharing and said we wanted to discuss global issues but that was a fight to the end. People wanted nuts and bolts and we wanted to stay away from them to address questions like "Can school-community teams make decisions together?" and have them raise questions they would face when they went back to their schools. (Carnegie School Planner)*

Six Regional Forums were held throughout the state and schools were invited to send teams (Appendix F). Five meetings were held at Regional Education Centers, and one at a high school. The meetings were after school and lasted an hour and a half. Total attendance for all 6 was 772 varying between 37 and 186 at individual sessions. Participants represented a range of roles in their systems including teachers, principals, superintendents, curriculum coordinators, reading specialists, gifted and talented instructors, educational consultants, guidance counselors, parents, and school committee chairs. The meetings followed a similar agenda:

- 4:00 Department of Education greeted participants
- 4:05 Massachusetts Teachers Association and Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents talked about Carnegie Schools
- 4:10 Department discussed legislation
- 4:20 Teachers Association described the workshop process and divided





participants into groups of 25-30 for facilitated discussions about issues they thought might develop as they moved forward. Facilitators were from the Department of Education, Massachusetts Teachers Association, Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents, and the Carnegie Technical Committee.

- 4:55 Reconvened for panel discussion of major topics raised in groups. Panels were composed of union members, superintendents, Technical Committee members (most frequently a principal), and moderated by a Department representative.
- 5:20 Department of Education representative discussed next steps for those interested in the program.

One of the planners described crucial aspects of the forums:

*It was very important for the union to say "we are not afraid of changing the rules" and the superintendents to say "we are not afraid of giving up power." We also wanted to model the kind of behavior we hoped would occur in the schools, so we divided participants into small groups. We asked them to identify the issues they thought would develop. These were very concrete and people went into the real gut questions like why would people be willing to give up their power. Again, when the panel met to respond to issues from brainstorming sessions, we tried to model the kind of conversations and discussions the school people might have back in their schools. Panel members tried to have a dialogue among themselves and not talk at the audience. (Carnegie School Planner)*

A sampling of questions asked (See Appendix G for more):

*What are the legal implications of altering governance?  
What if the whole staff is unwilling to make concessions or is uninterested in the idea?  
Will this program at some time be mandated for everyone?  
Is this a fad?  
Are there types of innovations that will be given priority?*

One Massachusetts Teachers Association facilitator commented:

*They did create some interesting dialogues in breakout sessions. By interesting I mean they came up with good questions. Possibilities were raised about relationships to the community and could a particular school do this? Some of these questions hadn't been raised in any discussions we'd had. It broadened the perspective. I stopped in my tracks. (Massachusetts Teachers Association)*

People came to the Forums with differing exposure to restructuring ideas, different expectations, and left with varying degrees of satisfaction. Some were



looking for more concrete information, and were disappointed, while others appreciated the design of the sessions:

*The brainstorming was good. It was good that the state came to us before the application was set to see what people looked for. It was encouraging.(principal)*

*The reaction to regional forums has been almost unanimously good. People liked the fact that nothing was cast in concrete and that options were open. (Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents)*

Several factors contributed to the mixed reactions:

- Some people came because they were interested and excited and curious, others because they were sent by their schools.

*The key to dissatisfaction was that a lot were sent there, not interested or believers in the concept. Unless you're a firm believer, it's not sexy stuff. If you believe in it, it is exciting stuff. (Technical Committee, superintendent)*

- Some people wished that they had been given a better picture of the approach of the meetings - that more input was being sought than information given. Possibly their definition of 'information' differed from the state's.

*The idea of our giving input was not clear and not what we expected. Make the process clear to people ahead of time. ( principal)*

- The forums, by design, did not provide as concrete information as some participants expected or wanted.

*The emphasis on the larger vision was good. There are pressures to be more specific but we expected them. (Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents)*

*People came looking for specific instructions per usual from the state; they wanted more specifics. The idea was to be deliberately vague and see what happened. (Technical Committee, superintendent)*

- The forums were uneven in quality. There were different presentors at each, they differed according to regional culture, one suffered from logistical problems including inadequate space and a false fire alarm, and the planners finetuned the process after each forum.



## PRINTED MATERIALS

Concurrent with the last forum the Department of Education sent out its first formal correspondence about the Carnegie Schools Program (Appendix H). This mailing was sent to every superintendent, principal, school committee chair and educational association president in Massachusetts - over 2000 in all, and broader than many statewide mailings:

*We did large scale dissemination because we see the process as an education process: 'Here are the issues you have to think about'. (CarnegieSchoolPlanner)*

The mailing included:

- A cover letter from the Commissioner
- A copy of the legislation
- A "Carnegie Schools Program Fact Sheet" which provided background information on the program, eligibility, timetable, project resources, and the decision process.
- A 'Concept Paper', developed in close collaboration with the Technical Committee, which clarified the meaning of Carnegie Schools through a discussion of its historical background and highlighting what Massachusetts' Carnegie School models will look like.
- A self-assessment instrument for schools
- An intent to apply form
- An announcement of a series of technical assistance meetings
- A selection of 6 articles on restructuring

The self assessment instrument was designed to help schools focus their discussions about school reform and, in the process, lead them to conclusions about their readiness and appropriateness for consideration as Carnegie Schools. The self assessment was described in these terms:

*It may be used to initiate a Carnegie School dialogue with an appropriate team from your school building/district. (cover letter)*

*If you are comfortable assessing the issues, and are confident in your responses, you may want to consider your appropriateness as a Carnegie School candidate . (self-assessment)*

The self-assessment lists 16 questions in the categories of vision, students, staff, organization, support, and history. A school's readiness for the program is probed by questions such as:

*What type of formal and informal processes are in place to encourage staff to participate in professional development, share information and ideas with colleagues, and spend time with peers inside and outside the school?*

*What approaches are in place to stimulate shared decisionmaking in such areas as curriculum development, instructional methods, staff selection, and budget allocations?*





---

*What type of support do (you) have at the district level for (your) ideas?*

The Department of Education, Technical Committee, and those recipients interviewed were all pleased with the mailing:

*I am very satisfied with the concept paper, literature, RFP, and self assessment. They are the result of collaborative thinking. The self-assessment form we love. We developed it because we wanted to give school-community teams an idea of the kind of questions they should be raising in their buildings. We told people that if they were comfortable with this and the other materials we would have statewide forums to distribute proposal information and discuss moving forward. (Carnegie School Planner)*

School based people reported finding the materials useful catalysts for discussion:

*I used the initial guidelines and papers to talk with staff about the idea and they were very interested. The information was very good. (principal)*

*The questions in the self assessment really helped. They opened up issues in their schools. I have heard 'the discussion itself was worth it and we can't turn back now'. (superintendent)*

For some, the self-assessment encouraged self-selection, as intended:

*I was glad for this direct mailing from the state. It was clear that this is a selective process. (principal).*

*The self assessment form convinced me I didn't have enough time. (Superintendent)*

*The self assessment was fine. I looked at it and thought 'we have some things going for us'. (principal)*

*The self assessment put a reality to it and gave people a more realistic assessment. (Technical Committee)*

One principal expressed her appreciation of the reprints whose inclusion she perceived as another departure for the Department.

*I liked the literature in particular. I have never seen that done before. It's the kind of thing that, once you see it, you say 'why hasn't that been done before?' Give us the research. It was real helpful...and there wasn't a bias. The articles were not slanted. It provides a variety of experience and is a tremendous approach. (principal)*





---

## QUESTION AND ANSWER BOOK

Questions and issues raised about the program during the start-up meetings and regional forums in particular were culled and the most common and significant ones developed into Chapter 727; Carnegie Schools, Questions and Answers, released April 5 and passed out at the subsequent informational/technical assistance meetings (Appendix I).

The booklet is divided into 4 main sections: Introduction to the Carnegie Schools Program, Becoming a Carnegie School, Carnegie Schools as it Relates to Other Programs, and Technical Issues. Thirty questions are addressed, both general (*What is meant by the term 'empowerment?'*) and specific (*What type of technical assistance will be available for Carnegie Schools?*).

People within the state found this document as useful as the other materials developed by the Department of Education.

*The questions and answers really guided us along . (principal )*

There was criticism that the role of the school principal in the Carnegie Schools was not addressed adequately in the Questions and Answer booklet. Since the Department of Education sees a clear and necessary role for the principal, the booklet would have been enhanced by this discussion.



## INFORMATIONAL/ TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE MEETINGS

The Regional Forums in March drew close to 800 participants and were followed by the statewide mailing which included an invitation to attend informational/technical assistance meetings April 11-13, sponsored by the Department of Education. Three meetings took place in three different locations around the state: the University of Massachusetts in Amherst, the Museum of Science in Boston, and Holy Cross College in Worcester. One hundred ninety one (191) people attended, an indication that the process was as self-selective as intended. The breakdown of participants representing 72 school districts, 102 schools, 3 universities was:

- 78 teachers
- 47 principals
- 8 superintendents and assistant superintendents
- 3 school committee representatives
- 3 parents
- 11 Department of Education representatives
- 41 others (including consultants, lawyers, guidance personnel, department chairs, etc.)

All meetings took place from 9-12 a.m. and were deliberately not held at the regional education centers, not only to shift away from a regional focus, but to demonstrate linkages with higher education and cultural institutions. The format included the following:

1. A presentation: the Department took the opportunity to continue the education/vision building process. Each meeting opened with a presentation by someone involved in restructuring efforts, including one speaker from the Technical Committee.
2. Department staff walked everyone through the application process.
3. Department staff addressed the 'hot' issues in the Question and Answer booklet, which was available along with the RFP.
4. Budget information was reviewed.
5. Questions were taken from the floor.

Two additional information resources were available: legal counsel from the Department was on hand to deal with contractual questions, and at the end of the meeting a Department representative spoke about other state funding sources.

Feedback from a few participants suggests that people found these meetings helpful:

*The state meetings were well run and as informative as the Department had information at that time. Within the time constraints, they were well handled. (superintendent)*

*While the regional forum was not particularly helpful to me, the overall process and the second meeting were very supportive, helpful, and informational. It was nice to hear from someone doing something (speaker) and the legal presence was good. (principal)*



## THE PROCESS, OVERALL

The process - forums, mailing, statewide meetings, Question and Answer booklet and the Request For Proposal itself led many schools to select themselves out of the application process. There were other contributing factors:

- Some schools selected themselves out because they felt that their school climates were wrong:

*There's not a positive feeling about Carnegie Schools in X; if a proposal comes from here it will be from the superintendent, not the rank and file.(teacher)*

*We are going through a lot of changes, too many of them. To do justice to a Carnegie School grant takes more time and stability than we have (principal)*

- The tight time frame precluded others from considering applying in the first cycle:

*We didn't submit because the timetable is too rapid. I would like to consider it in the future . (superintendent)*

- The newness of the program meant that others waited to see what would happen, either because they were unsure what the state meant by restructuring, or were unsure of the funding:

*There were two groups-those who knew what they were doing already and those who said 'what's this all about?' It will take 1-2 years for the second group to become really interested. I am not sure we have convinced the doubting Thomases so far but they may need to see some programs out there first.(Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents)*

The process was open and unstructured by design. The planners wanted to get across the message that *if you're not comfortable with this you won't be comfortable with Carnegie Schools*. Some people were as uncomfortable with the process as a whole as they were with the ambiguousness of the Regional Forums, but many have praised the process, believing that it is the only feasible approach to take:

*The idea of being free and open is frustrating and liberating but necessary because of what Carnegie is.(principal)*

*Having the process wide open with the formal recognition that school improvement has to be local is good. It encourages us to tough it out and invent our own programs. (teacher)*





*It's been helpful to have the openness with which the idea evolved. The concept was in place to build on but there was no one model. It was not a package. What came through was that there were certain ingredients toward the end of better education in classrooms for kids. We were encouraged to think how WE would do it.*  
(Technical Committee)

## THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

The RFP (Appendix J) was also available at the technical assistance meetings of April 11-13; final proposals were due May 20. Feedback on the RFP itself has come mostly from the review team, although a few school practitioners have also offered comments.

The RFP is more flexible and open ended than most coming from the Department in accordance with the concept that there is no one model for Carnegie Schools; the planners wanted to leave schools room to invent. The RFP begins by listing the intent of the Carnegie Schools Program (innovative organizational and management systems, designed by school-community based planning teams, with the underlying element being shared decision-making), and continues with the question: *Tell us how this will occur in your school*. Applicants are asked to describe their vision, model of shared decision-making, types of anticipated restructuring, plan for carrying out change, cost, and planning to date. Selection criteria are also listed in relation to each of these points, and examples are called for in each category.

The narrative sections of the proposals that were submitted ranged from 1-50 pages. The format left room for very interesting and well-conceived narratives, on the one hand, and some rambling narratives without clear organization, on the other. Reviewers found some of the latter difficult to read. Although the Department of Education is considering revising the RFP for the next cycle, it is unwilling to use an overly confining and prescriptive format.

A number of those schools who applied in the first cycle had already done a fair amount of thinking, planning, and even implementation around restructuring issues. They were 'ready to move' within the tight schedule. Two schools, in fact, applied for 'implementation grants' instead of planning grants, which the RFP allowed "in special situations". Several others schools, judged by their proposals, put together planning teams hastily in order to meet the criteria for funding, although they were not prepared to move on restructuring

## THE PROPOSALS

Thirty eight (38) schools and districts from all over Massachusetts submitted proposals by May 20. On May 23 a letter was mailed to each one outlining the anticipated timeline for reading proposals and visiting selected sites. Schools were asked to alert all members of their school-community planning teams to the possibility of a visit between June 6-17.

Proposals were submitted by school systems in the following cities and towns:

<u>Northwest Region</u>	<u>Greater Boston Region</u>	<u>Greater Springfield Region</u>
Greenfield	Boston	Springfield
Sheffield	Belmont	Amherst
Pittsfield	Cambridge	Westfield
	Westwood	Hampden
	Concord	Easthampton
	Somerville	Chicopee



#### Northeast Region

Reading  
Rowley  
Peabody  
Lawrence  
Rockport

#### Southeast Region

Bridgewater  
Westport  
Hanson  
Martha's Vineyard

#### Central Region

Holliston  
Fitchburg  
Southborough  
Framingham  
Harvard  
Marlborough  
Worcester

The proposals included applications from 23 elementary schools, 6 high schools, 3 junior highs, 3 middle schools, 1 regional 5-12 school, and 2 districts. The proposals from schools nominated for planning grants are synopsized in Appendix K.

## TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Planning for technical assistance began along with other start-up planning for the whole program. From the beginning the Department of Education projected a three pronged approach including assistance for schools:

- who receive planning grants
- who apply and do not receive awards
- who do not apply but would like to know more about restructuring

Individuals experienced in the many diverse areas that come under restructuring will be engaged to provide technical assistance. The technical assistance plan (Appendix L ) is described as:

1. Offered to schools on a voluntary basis and with a minimum of red tape
2. Offered with the understanding that local schools know best what they need
3. Responsive to the unique needs of individual school building/community teams
4. Responsive to the need for information on, and access to, the national and statewide network of schools involved in restructuring activities
5. Provided in a timely manner by experienced individuals, within and outside of the Department, who represent a diversity of skills, backgrounds, and interests. The emerging list of consultants includes experts in group dynamics, organizational development and change, school based management, and new curriculum and instruction strategies.

Technical assistance is envisioned as encompassing a variety of services such as one day training sessions on specific topics, retreats for grant recipients, leadership training sessions to help principals empower teachers, on site consultation, and a newsletter chronicling the developments at selected sites.

In the pre-award period technical assistance took two forms: statewide technical assistance meetings (as described), and consultation with individual schools that contacted the Department of Education in connection with applications. All those who called were invited to come to the Department's offices for face to face meetings.

One recommendation emerging from the first grant application cycle is for a more proactive and systematic assistance program for those schools applying for grants. People on the review teams and in the schools suggested that applicants would benefit from sitting down with a Department representative before writing anything,



---

anything, to go over ideas and review plans. A longer timeline should make this feasible:

*We need more time, a different RFP, and to see if some people need more guidance before putting anything in writing. In November we won't find people applying who have just started thinking about restructuring. Those who apply will be schools that started in the spring but weren't quite ready. Technical assistance is the key. (Technical Committee)*





THE REVIEW  
PROCESS:  
PROPOSAL  
READING  
AND SITE  
SELECTION

- Grant recipients were selected through a three step process that included
- Proposal reading by 3 teams who narrowed down the 38 submissions to 10 final candidates for site visits
  - Full day site visits to the ten schools by teams composed of a subset of proposal readers (two teams total, each visited 5)
  - A one day meeting combining the two site teams to nominate 7 grant recipients

Without knowing how many proposals would come in and working on a very tight schedule (proposals due May 20, and readers convened June 1), the Department of Education made preparations to handle 120 submissions. Six teams of 3-5 persons each were recruited in anticipation. The Community Education Advisory Council, the Chapter 188 Evaluation Advisory Committee, the Leadership Academy, Lucretia Crocker Fellows, and the Technical Committee were asked to recommend people to participate in the review process. Each Regional Center Director was asked to send a representative to sit on the team. This was viewed as in-service training for the staff in preparation for eventual regionalization of the program.

When 38 proposals were submitted, the planners established the final teams, each of which was led by a Regional Department staff member. Two elementary teams were organized and each read proposals from three regions (23 proposals total). One non-elementary team was set up to read a total of 15 proposals from all six regions. The term 'elementary' was used to describe K-6 and K-8 schools, while 'non-elementary' included all other configurations: high schools, 5-8, 5-12, and a K-12 resource center. Team composition was:

<u>A. elementary sites</u>	<u>B. elementary sites</u>	<u>C. non-elementary sites</u>
3 DOE	4 DOE	2 DOE
2 teachers	1 teacher	4 teachers
1 principal	1 principal	1 principal
1 parent	1 parent	1 superintendent

Including 'outsiders' in the proposal review process was a departure for the Department, which usually handles similar processes internally. The balance of different constituents was valuable because participants read and viewed proposals from different perspectives and asked different questions.

An orientation for proposal readers was held on May 26 at Bentley College, where participants received proposals, guidelines and rating sheets for reading proposals and visiting sites (Appendix M). The objectives were to:

1. Orient members of the review team to the goals and philosophy of the Carnegie School initiative;
2. Provide an overview of the Carnegie School process and specific information about the roles and responsibilities of the review team;
3. Distribute the proposals and rating sheets to review team members;
4. Provide an opportunity for members to become acquainted with others on their team.

Participants met from 3:00-8:00 for a program that included

- an introduction to Carnegie Schools by a Carnegie School Planner
- a presentation by a Technical Committee member about restructuring-



"Multiple Visions, Specific Translations"- an inspiring presentation of 4 high schools' restructuring efforts

- questions and answers
- breaking into teams and sharing aspects of the program "that intrigued" participants
- review of responsibilities of review team including a discussion of how to read proposals and a review of the criteria rating sheets
- review of the site team visitation process
- assignment to reading teams and distribution of proposals
- dinner

The presenters emphasized that readers should *"look for schools with a history of success and a capacity to bring about real change"*. Readers were asked to look for quality as they read the proposals and worked through the criteria sheets.

At each opportunity the reviewers asked thoughtful questions about the process such as:

- *Should we differentially weight new (to the system) vs long-time school superintendents?*
- *What kinds of evaluation have been done in relation to restructuring projects?*
- *Are we looking for schools that are well along the way or those that are desperate and anything would be an improvement?*

The orientation was perceived as successful by both the planners and participants. The only adjustment anticipated next time around is the inclusion of a presenter experienced with elementary restructuring projects.

The reading teams read through their assigned proposals before convening for the selection process on June 1-2. The first day began with a half hour review of the reading process, comments and questions. People then met in teams, elementary in one large room and non-elementary in another. The non-elementary team was instructed to select its top five proposals, while each of the elementary teams was asked to select four, for a total of 8 elementary proposals to be narrowed down to five by the combined groups at the end of the process.

The non-elementary team selected its final 5 candidates by the end of the first day while each of the two elementary teams selected their top four. The morning of the second day the two remaining teams swapped and read their top four proposals, and met as one group to select the final 5 in the afternoon.

Teams were asked to generate lists of issues and questions for the site visit teams to address.

As readers had been asked to rate proposals numerically, they began by reading out their scores one at a time within their teams, in some cases offering comments and observations at the same time.

They then averaged the scores, creating a single prioritized list. Teams adopted different strategies for eliminating proposals. One began by eliminating the bottom two and selecting the top two, using averaged scores, and then proceeded to work their way from both direction towards the center of the list. Another group worked its way down from the top. There was a lot of agreement between the ratings, different people assigned to the proposals. In the non-elementary team the final 5 proposals were listed among every team member's top six choices.

Once the final 10 proposals had been selected the site teams met briefly with the planners to discuss scheduling.





The Department had some difficulty finding as many site team members as planned because of the short notice, the time commitment (5 full days), and the time of year (end of school). Several people who had volunteered dropped out at the last minute. Consequently, the Department did not meet its goal of racial and urban/suburban balance as fully as intended. The final site visit teams were composed of:

elementary team

2 teachers  
1 parent  
2 DOE

secondary team

4 teachers  
1 superintendent  
2 DOE  
1 principal

## SITE VISITS

*I said over and over again that I felt like an anthropologist digging out the real culture of the school. It was a very intense, collapsed kind of anthropology, and we went with prepared minds. 80% of what we found out I had gone prepared for and was right on target, and 20% I got from keeping an open mind. A good investigator has to be both prepared and open at the same time. (site team member)*

The day after the reading process was completed the 10 sites were notified by phone and a schedule of visits arranged. Schools were asked to arrange meetings between the site team members and various groups such as the community-school based planning teams, groups of teachers, the principal, the superintendent, and representatives of the school committee.

Each school hosted a full day visit which typically included both structured meetings and unstructured time in which team members visited classrooms and had spontaneous conversations with both students and teachers. (In some schools the teams had to engineer unstructured time due to the heavy scheduling.)

The role composition of the teams worked well and team members commented on the value of having the complimentary perspectives that different members contributed. Not only did individuals ask different kinds of questions, and notice different things, their respective roles lent a credibility to conversations with their counterparts in the schools.

*The team worked well together and the mix of different constituencies was fantastic. Everyone asks a different kind of question. The superintendent asked questions I wouldn't dream of asking. (site team member)*

*It was essential to have that mix of people on our team. I was teamed with a principal who asked other principals questions I never thought of. (site team member)*

Although the mix of role representatives was good, team members regretted the absence of minority members and felt, in addition, that a more urban experience base among members would have benefitted the teams.





Members of both teams found that the visits were crucial for answering questions raised during the reading process:

*The site visits clarified every issue that came from the reading group. We could see connections between things. (site team member)*

*We did not leave with lingering doubts or unanswered questions. It was easy to get answers; no one held back. (site team member)*

Various team members mentioned specific areas that were clarified by the visitation process including:

- What does shared decisionmaking mean to the school? In one school the team discovered that although shared decisionmaking was referred to in the proposal, the principal was actually the final decisionmaker.
- Who wrote the proposal? If outside consultants did, how much input did teachers have?
- How did the rest of the faculty fit in? In one school a group of 35 teachers approached the visiting team and asked what the proposal was like; they had only seen a summary of it.

A couple of team members observed that they got better and better at their job as time passed, and as they learned 'how to cut through the 'baloney' both by isolating interviewees and by asking tough questions. They also found the unstructured time of great value, providing opportunities for spontaneous conversations in teachers' lounges and with students in the halls.

Teams encountered little difficulty in ranking their final Carnegie selections on June 23. One team had complete agreement on the schools ranked first, second and fourth, with one individual disagreeing about the third and fifth place schools. In the other team members agreed on the top two and one school to eliminate, with some dissension about the middle two schools. In both situations a majority count produced the final selection of schools. Without explicit directions to come up with a particular quota, the two teams made their recommendations of four elementary and 3 non-elementary schools, which were recommended for the award of planning grants June 23.



## WHAT CAN WE PASS ON?

There is not, and can not be, one model for initiating restructuring efforts on a statewide level. What any state does has to fit its way of doing business. There are a few ingredients that may, however, be common to successful programs.

Build public awareness and support.

*It is important to build public awareness and support because you are making fundamental changes. Other states have done this in quite different ways. All had very different approaches to getting started and all had the object of a few schools.*

*Massachusetts combined the elements with a legislative program, not gangbuster size because Nick (Paleologos) and Dick (Kraus) see it as evolving over years, not as one piece of legislation. This was very wise. It fits the temperament of Massachusetts, and took advantage of Kraus 'and Paleologos' skills. It was not just fought out in the Legislature. They structured hearings nicely for all views to be put on the table and barnstormed the state to get grassroots involvement. (Technical Committee)*

Develop trust in the Department of Education if necessary.

*Carnegie Schools is like stepping off of a precipice. It is not safe. You need to trust those people, you need a basis. It means for a Department of Education in another state that if you don't have trust, you'd better be willing to invest to develop it. (Massachusetts Elementary School Principals Association)*

Look at what has been done elsewhere.

*For another state I'd recommend: Talk with other states, visit a school, get a feel for a new (restructured) one. (Technical Committee)*

*For another state, more concrete examples from the outset would be helpful for people. Knowing common elements would make it easier for people thinking about it. (Department representative)*

Believe in it.

*People in the Department of Education must believe in their heart of hearts in site based management. (Massachusetts Elementary School Principals Association)*

Give the process more time than we did, if you can.



---

**WHAT WAS  
EFFECTIVE IN  
MASSACHUSETTS  
INCLUDED:**

- Early collaboration between the Commissioner of Education, the Governor's Office on Educational Affairs, and the Legislature
- The Commissioner's leadership and investment in the process
- Modelling the kinds of communication and program development that the Department of Education wanted to see in schools working on restructuring efforts
- Designing the meetings, mailings, and RFP to be self-selective
- Working closely with constituencies that may need to redefine their roles: superintendents, principals, school committees, and unions.





---

# Appendix A



---

# Appendix B



## Chronology of Events

- 1985 • Chapter 188, Public School Improvement Act, establishment of Special Commission on the Conditions of Teaching
- 1986-7 • Commission develops idea of Carnegie Schools
- 1987 • Publication of Leading the Way: The Report on the Special Conditions of Teaching. Carnegie Schools proposed.
  - Legislation written for Chapter 727
  - National Governors Association Grant, funding planning process for Carnegie School
  - Department of Education planners meet with stakeholders
- 1988
  - Jan • Legislature passes Chapter 727 including Carnegie Schools
  - Jan • Technical Advisory Committee begins meeting
  - Mar • Regional forums held, cosponsored by Massachusetts Teachers Association, Department of Education, Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents
  - Mar • Mailing to all principals, superintendents, school committee chairs, educational association presidents and teachers' unions
  - April • Chapter 727, Carnegie Schools, Questions and Answers written, based on forums
  - April • Informational meetings held by Department of Education; RFP distributed
  - May • Proposals for planning grants due for first funding cycle
  - May • Orientation for proposal readers and site visitors
  - June • Proposals read, finalists selected June 1-2
  - June • Sites visited June 6-17
  - June • Grant recipients nominated June 23





---

# Appendix C



---

# Appendix D



---

## Carnegie Technical Committee

Barbara Berns, Director, Planning, Research and Evaluation, MA DOE  
Irwin Blumer, Superintendent of Schools, Newton  
William Brooks, Teacher and Lucretia Crocker Fellow  
Dr. Daniel Cheever, President, Wheelock College  
John Correiro, Superintendent of Schools, Fall River  
William Dandridge, Director, MA Field Center for Teaching and Learning  
Dr. Don Davies, Chairman, Educational Leadership, BU School of Education  
Paula Evans, Coalition for Essential Schools, Brown University  
Susan Freedman, Director, Office of Community Education, MA DOE  
Charles Gibbons, Deputy Superintendent, Boston  
Norm Nijamy, Principal, Leadership Academy Fellow  
Charles Orloff, Principal, Leadership Academy Fellow  
Harold Raynolds Jr., Commissioner of Education, MA DOE  
Jon Saphier, Director of Research for Better Teaching  
Robert Schwartz, Special Assistant to the Governor for Educational Affairs  
Dr. Robert Sinclair, Director, Coalition For School Improvement  
Marc Tucker, President, National Center on Education and the Economy  
William Ubinas, Principal, Boston





---

# Appendix E





